

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 17-40 are pending in the application.

Claims 32-40 are newly added. New independent claim 32 is somewhat similar to claim 3, but does not employ § 112, ¶ 6 language (e.g., “means”).

Reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Office’s withdrawal of the earlier-appealed rejections, over Hudetz (5,978,773) in view of Philyaw (6,337,986), is noted with appreciation

Claims 1, 3-5 and 17-31 are newly rejected over Weiss (7,065,559). The rejection repeatedly relies on Weiss’ disclosure at col. 7, lines 57-67.

In earlier parts of the disclosure, Weiss teaches that a code scanned from a printed article can be employed to obtain an electronic copy of the article. In the disclosure at col. 7, lines 57-67, Weiss states that obtaining an electronic copy of the article is not the only functionality contemplated; his system can also retrieve and download a recipe for a meal featured in the article, or a coupon for a product mentioned in the article.

Applicants’ claimed arrangements are not taught or suggested by Weiss.

For example, appealed claim 1 required “additional objects” that do not have the same object identifier sensed from the first object. There is no teaching in Weiss that the recipe, or coupon, have object identifiers associated therewith, and that their identifiers are different than the object identifier sensed from the first object (i.e., the article).

To make this distinction still clearer, applicants have amended claim 1 in minor respects.

For example, Weiss does not teach the amended claim limitation of “*identifying a second object identifier different than the first object identifier.*” Nor does he teach “*identifying a second item of address information corresponding to said second object identifier.*”

Still further, the claim has been amended with a requirement about the order in which the address information is sent, i.e., “*the second item of address information being sent after the first item of address information has been sent.*”

Neither Weiss nor any of the other art of record teaches or suggest such limitations, so withdrawal of the claim 1 rejection is solicited.

Similarly, appealed independent claim 17 required foreseeing information about object payloads that may be forthcoming “*but that do not share with the first object the payload data with which the database was queried.*”

Weiss has no teaching on this point. He is silent about any payload data associated with the recipe or coupon. It would appear that his recipe or coupon shares the same payload as his article, since Weiss does not teach any other means by which the recipe or the coupon could be identified.

To make this distinction clearer, applicants have amended claim 17 to require that the *other* sent address information is associated with *other* physical objects, but is not associated with the *sensed* object. This requirement is not met by Weiss; the address for his coupon/recipe is associated with the article being sensed.

(Claim 17 has also been amended to include a requirement about the order in which the address information is sent, i.e., “*anticipatorily sending address information associated with such foreseen object payloads after sending address information associated with the first physical object.*”)

Again, neither Weiss nor any of the other art of record teaches or suggest such limitations, so withdrawal of the claim 17 rejection is solicited.

In addition to other reasons for its allowability over Weiss, appealed independent claim 23 included a temporal limitation missing from Weiss’ disclosure. Claim 23 requires that the “additional objects” be identified “after initiating” the link based on the sensed object.

Weiss does not teach such arrangement. (*I.e.*, there is no teaching that Weiss initiates a link to the electronic copy of the article, and thereafter Weiss identifies the associated recipe/coupon.)

Again, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Appealed independent claim 24 has a related temporal limitation: the address information associated with foreseen object payloads is sent “after initiating said electronic link.” Again, the art has no such teaching.

Appealed independent claim 30 has an *order* limitation: the method foresees the *order* in which other object payloads may be forthcoming, and anticipatorily sends address information associated with such foreseen object payloads *in such order*.

Again, Weiss has no such teaching.

The system defined by appealed independent claim 3 is also not taught by Weiss. That arrangement requires both a routing means and a product handler means. The routing means passes information to the product handler means. The product handler means provides a response (e.g., a link related to the object) back to the originating device.

Weiss does not teach such an arrangement. The Office construed Weiss’ Bridge Server 20 as being the claimed routing means.¹ However, it is also Weiss’ Bridge Server that provides the link related to the object (*see, e.g.*, col. 8, lines 8-11). Thus, Weiss’ Bridge Server is being interpreted as fulfilling both the “routing means” and the “product handler means” claim limitations.

To make this distinction clearer, claim 3 has been amended to specify “the product handler means being distinct from the routing means.”

Moreover, applicants have further amended claim 3 to require that the “routing means” identify the product handler means “from among *plural different* product handler means.” It is then the *identified* product handler means that provide a response (e.g., link) back to the originating device. Again, Weiss has no teaching on this point.

¹ January 25, 2008, Action, page 5.

(A similar requirement is present in new claim 32.)

For brevity's sake, these remarks have only addressed certain of the claims, and have detailed only certain of the distinctions between the claims and the art. However, such discussion is believed sufficient to establish the allowability of all pending claims. Thus, applicants do not further belabor this paper with other arguments concerning the rejections, the art, and the claims – all of which are reserved for possible presentation to the Board.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) is submitted herewith.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to patent 7,206,820 to Rhoads, which is a continuation of the present application. Its claim 6 concerns an arrangement employing a router and plural handlers. This application was appealed to the Board, and the Board reversed the Examiner's rejection of the claims (including claim 6, which had been rejected over Moskowitz, 5,822,432).

The other Rhoads patents on the IDS are also commonly owned. Independent claims in 7,058,697 were earlier rejected over EP 493,091 and 5,315,098. Independent claims in 7,051,086 were earlier rejected over EP 493,091 and 5,978,773. Independent claims in 6,542,927 were earlier rejected over EP 493,091, 5,613,004 and 5,848,413. Independent claims in 6,324,573 were earlier rejected over EP 493,091. Independent claims in 6,311,214 were earlier rejected over 5,848,413 and 5,841,978. Independent claims in 6,286,036 were earlier rejected over 5,613,004, 5,782,692 and 5,848,413. Independent claims in 5,841,978 were earlier rejected over 5,530,852 and 5,613,004. (The noted art was found in a review of Amendments and other responses submitted by the assignee to the Office, rather than a review of Office Actions.)

When the Examiner takes this Amendment up for consideration, he is requested to telephone the undersigned to schedule a telephonic interview. It is believed that a

discussion of the points raised herein - rather than an exchange of writings - may help bring prosecution of this application (now pending 8+ years) to a close.

Date: April 25, 2008

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By /William Y Conwell/
William Y. Conwell
Registration No. 31,943